Case 1:00-cv-01898-VSB-VF Document 3611 Filed 02/04/13 Page 1 of 9

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

In Re: Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether ("MTBE") Products Liability Litigation

This document relates to:

City of Fresno v. Chevron U.S.A. Inc., et al

24 CIV 4973 (SAS)

STIPULATION AND ORDER RE SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON PLAINTIFF'S CLAIM FOR TRESPASS

Master File No. 00 Civ. 1898 MDL 1358 (SAS) M21-88

## STIPULATION AND ORDER RE SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON PLAINTIFF'S CLAIM FOR TRESPASS

The undersigned parties hereby stipulate as follows:

WHEREAS, on October 22, 2003, Plaintiff City of Fresno ("Plaintiff" or the "City") filed its Complaint against Defendants Chevron U.S.A. Inc., *et al*, in the Superior Court for the State of California, San Francisco County, alleging that Defendants were liable for contaminating the City of Fresno's public drinking water supplies with MTBE and TBA. The Complaint included a claim for relief for Trespass.

WHEREAS, the case was removed to federal court and transferred to this Court.

WHEREAS, on October 28, 2004, Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint, which included a claim for relief for Trespass.

WHEREAS, on June 20, 2011, this Court issued an order disposing of Plaintiff Orange County Water District's claim for Trespass on summary judgment in the matter *Orange County Water District v. Unocal, et al.* 04 Civ. 4968 (the "OCWD" matter).

WHEREAS, on December 12, 2012, a group of Defendants submitted a letter brief to the Court requesting permission to a file a Motion for Summary Judgment regarding the City's

Trespass claim. The letter brief was joined by Defendant Nella Oil Company. Defendants' letter brief explained that their Motion for Summary Judgment regarding Trespass would argue that the ruling in the *OCWD* matter should be applied consistently to the *City of Fresno* case. Specifically, Defendants argued that:

- This Court has already found in the OCWD matter that, under California law, "A trespass is an invasion of the interest in the exclusive possession of land, as by entry upon it ..." In re Methyl Tertiory Butyl Ether ("MTBE") Prods. Liab. Litig., 824 F. Supp. 2d 524, 545 (S.D.N.Y. 2011) (quoting Wilson v. Interlake Steel Co., 185 Cal. Rptr. 280, 283 (1982) (emphasis added by Court).)
- The Court further noted that a usufructuary right is appropriative, and that "[t]he right of an appropriator ... is ... subordinate to an overlying right-holder." *Id.* at 546.
- In disposing of the Orange County Water District's claim for trespass because the District lacked exclusive possession, this Court further noted that "exclusive possession is a necessary prerequisite to bringing a trespass claim." *In re Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 279 F.R.D. 131, 139 (S.D.N.Y. 2011).
- The City of Fresno's trespass claim is no different. Plaintiff does not have an exclusive right such that it can assert a claim for trespass under California law.

WHEREAS, on December 21, 2012, Plaintiff submitted a letter brief opposing

Defendants' request, responding to the points raised in the Defendants' December 12 letter, and arguing that summary judgment of the Trespass claim would be improper. Specifically, Plaintiff argued the following:

- The ruling in OCWD should not be applied to the City of Fresno because the City was different than the Orange County Water District: use of water for domestic purposes carries the highest priority under the California Constitution, the City has a public water system permit issued by the State, has the right to withdraw water from the aquifer to provide water to the public, and is exercising both the State's rights through the permit and its own water purveyor rights.
- The City is entitled to a full panoply of tort remedies. County of Santa Clara v. Atlantic Richfield, Co., 137 Cal. App. 4th 292, 313 (2006).

WHEREAS, on December 31, 2012, Defendants submitted a reply letter brief to the Court responding to Plaintiff's contentions.

WHEREAS, the Court heard argument regarding the potential motion on January 11, 2013, including the City's argument that it was asserting different rights than OCWD by virtue of its extraction and sale of water pursuant to a State permit. In the argument, it was pointed out that this Court ruled in the OCWD matter, "OCWD's common law claims derived from its property rights in the groundwater within its territory" and "[e]arlier in this [OCWD] litigation OCWD argued, and this Court accepted, both that OCWD has usufructuary rights in the groundwater that it alleges that the defendants have contaminated [citations] and that these rights are not subservient. . . Furthermore, it is on the basis of these property rights that OCWD is able to pursue its common law claims." (676 F. Supp. 2d 139, 146 & n.40). The Court indicated that (1) it appeared that the decision in OCWD would apply here, and the basis of the trespass claims of the City and OCWD were not materially different such that the result would be different, and (2) the parties should not file summary judgment motions where the claims are not

materially distinguishable from claims adjudicated by the Court in motions in focus cases applying the same State's law.

WHEREAS, the parties are mindful of the Court's directive and do not want to unnecessarily burden the Court.

WHEREAS, Plaintiff is willing to forego the summary judgment process on the Trespass claim so long as Plaintiff does not waive the right to appeal the decision applying the *OCWD* ruling to this case or to argue in any such appeal that the *OCWD* ruling was incorrect. Plaintiff retains the right to argue all grounds for appeal, except that Plaintiff does, however, waive the right to appeal this order on the grounds that the entry of it is procedurally improper.

Accordingly, the parties agree to and request that the following order be entered by the Court in lieu of briefing and hearing a Motion for Summary Judgment:

[PROPOSED] ORDER

## IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that:

- 1. Summary Judgment is entered against Plaintiff on the Trespass claim based on the reasoning and authorities set forth above, in the Court's trespass decision in the OCWD case, in the parties' letter briefs filed in this case, and in the hearing on January 11, 2013.
  - 2. The Trespass claim against all Defendants is dismissed with prejudice.
- 3. Plaintiff shall retain the right to appeal this order as if it were a ruling granting a defense Motion for Summary Judgment. Signing this stipulation and entry of this order shall in no way be construed as any waiver of the right to appeal.
- 4. Plaintiff retains the right to argue all grounds for appeal, except that Plaintiff does, however, waive the right to appeal this order on the grounds that the entry of it is procedurally improper. Plaintiff may not challenge the entry of summary judgment on the grounds that the parties did not fully brief the issue or submit sufficient evidence to the Court because the parties are all voluntarily submitting to this abbreviated process.

SO STIPULATED:

Dated: 1-3 , 2013

Ву

MICHAEL AXLINE
EVAN EICKMEYER
Miller, Axline, & Sawyer

1050 Fulton Avenue Suite 100 Sacramento, California 95825-4225

Telephone: Facsimile:

(916) 488-6688 (916) 488-4288

Attorneys for Plaintiff
CITY OF FRESNO

Dated: February , 2013

JEFFREY J. PARKER (jparker@sheppardmullin.com)
WHITNEY JONES ROY (wroy@sheppardmullin.com)

for Peter Condron

Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP

333 South Hope Street, 43<sup>rd</sup> Floor Los Angeles, California 90071

Telephone: (213) 620-1780 Facsimile: (213) 620-1398

Attorneys for Defendant

**EXXON MOBIL CORPORATION** 

Dated: February , 2013

RICHARD E. WADLACE, JR.

SCOTT D. MROZ

PETER C. CONDRON

Sedgwick LLP 2900 K Street, NW

Harbourside - Suite 500 Washington, D.C. 20007

Telephone: (202) 204-1000 Facsimile: (202) 204-1001

Attorneys for Defendants

SHELL OIL COMPANY, TEXACO REFINING AND MARKETING INC., EQUILON ENTERPRISES LLC,

AND EQUIVA SERVICES LLC

Dated: February 1, 2013
By

NATHAN P. ELMER (neimer@ejmerstahl.com)

(New York Bar No. 1976067) PAMELA R. HANEBUTT (phanebutt@eimerstahl.com)

LISA S. MEYER (lmeyer@eimerstahl.com)

Eimer Stahl LLP

224 South Michigan Avenue, Suite 1100

Chicago, IL 60604

Telephone (312) 660-7600 Facsimile: (312) 692-1718

Attorneys for Defendant

CITGO PETROLEUM CORPORATION

Dated: February , 2013

BRIAN M. LEDGER (CA SBN 156942)

Gordon & Rees LLP

bledger@gordonrees.com

101 W. Broadway, Suite 1600

San Diego, CA 92101

Telephone: (619) 696-6700 Facsimile: (619) 696-7124 Attorney for Defendant

KERN OIL & REFINING CO.

Dated: February , 2013

PETER M. HARD

LECLAIRRYAN, LLP

Peter.Hart@leclairryan.com
44 Montgomery Street, 18th Floor

San Francisco, California 94104-4705

Telephone: (415) 391-7111 Facsimile: (415) 391-8766 Attorneys for Defendant

NELLA OIL COMPANY

Dated: Felskuny , 2013

JON D. ANDERSON

Latham & Watkins ILD

650 Town Center Dr., 20th Floor

Costa Mesa, CA 92626 Telephone: (714) 540-1235

Facsimile: (714) 755-8290

Attorneys for Defendant CONOCOPHILLIPS COMPANY, individually and as successor-in-interest to Defendant TOSCO CORPORATION and Phillips

for Jon Anderson

Petroleum Company

Dated: February 1, 2013

ROBERT E. MEADOWS JEREMIAH J. ANDERSON for Charles Cornell

for Bant Allen

1100 Louisiana, Suite 4000 Houston, Texas 77002 Tel: (713) 751-3200

Fax: (713) 751-3290

CHARLES C. CORRELL JR. 101 Second Street, Suite 2300 San Francisco, California 94105

Tel: (415) 318-1200 Fax: (415) 318-1300

Attorneys for Defendants

CHEVRON U.S.A. INC. AND UNION OIL

COMPANY OF CALIFORNIA

Dated: February , 2013

By

ALAN J. HOFFMAN

JEFFREY S. MOLLER

JOHN J. DICHELLO Blank Rome LLP

One Logan Square, 130 N. 18th Street Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103-6998

Telephone: (215) 569-5500

Faesimile:

(215) 569-5555

Attorneys for Defendant

LYONDELL CHEMICAL COMPANY, formerly known as "ARCO CHEMICAL COMPANY"

Dated: February , 2013

Ву

BRENT ALLEN Greenberg-Traurig LLP

2101 L Street, N.W., Suite 1000

Washington, DC 20037

Telephone: (212) 331-3157

Facsimile:

(212) 330-5890

Attorneys for Defendant

COASTAL CHEM, INC.

Dated: February 1, 2013

COLLEEN P. DOYLE

DIANA PFEFFER MARTIN

Hunton & Williams LLP

550 So. Hope Street, Suite 2000

Los Angeles, California 90071

Telephone: (213) 532-2000 (213) 532-2020 Facsimile:

Attorneys for Defendants

TESORO CORPORATION (F/K/A TESORO PETROLEUM CORPORATION) AND TESORO

REFINING and MARKETING COMPANY

(ERRONEOUSLY NAMED AS TESORO REFINING

AND MARKETING COMPANY, INC.)

Dated: (-clorusty 1, 2013

Ву

M. COY CONNELLA

AMY E. PARKER

Bracewell & Giuliani LLP 711 Louisiana St., Suite 2300

Houston, Texas 77002

Telephone: (713) 221-1335

Facsimile: (713) 221-2159 Attorneys for Defendants

ULTRAMAR INC., VALERO MARKETING AND SUPPLY COMPANY and VALERO REFINING

COMPANY-CALIFORNIA

SO ORDERED:

THE HONORABLE SHIRA A. SCHEINDLIN